

Aesthetic Regimes – is History Artistic, what is a Form of Power?

By Shomit Sirohi and Cornel West

I. Forms of Power and Resistance to Power – Cornel West on Democracy

Power is finally an institution and sets of institutions, but then of course there is history, which is about aesthetic production – one can tell the black people are excluded from democracy. Since the Athenian republic in fact the sensible multiplicity before the form of consciousness is then in the Kantian sense a reduction or bracketing which means the whole of beauty arises out of disinterest. It means one lives a life.

II. Power, Forms of Power and Artistic Regimes – History

In fact Foucault meant just that, that the history of sexuality is about the repression of women's needs and and feminine sexuality and renditions of that – and is therefore ridden with power. Even black people one can argue are being oppressed and that then is power. History has this fact before it, as I conceptualise the Bible, let me grant you an expressive Christian life, all we ask for is aesthetic or artistic regimes of life. My joke Sony Management following you to live life as equals. I meant that is immanence, that is life, and that is the art of life. What surrealism would call life transformed to art. Or the art and aesthetics of life – even aesthesis that at one point I am walking in a small apartment and at the next in a taxi I make it to a small shop and that was the whole aesthetic journey. Why life is so aesthetic for me, and not for others one might argue in psychoanalytic testimony, is that I live life as resistance, or dialectically, in practical transformation of the epoche.

III. Cornel West – Aesthetics and Black Lives therefore – Can we Live an Artistic Life? Or even a Painterly Life in Oppression even? Christ would say yes one can always live an artistic life, one can always force this truth.

In fact Foucault means power has to be changed to artistic power – this then is power and resistance, that there is resistance afterall – I call Sirohi living in resistance, deeply about the resistance and living in time with resistance. He adds that power should not be like power which is oppressive, one should just live instead by fighting power in an emancipated spectator. He means that the spectator of theatre, is then watching the theatre, which then is just the actors acting and this can be a bad play as well, but the spectator is emancipated, he knows the truth.

IV. Interviews in Parantheses

What then is a system of production, or even ensemble of production and the distribution of the sensible, to the set of institutions of power, can democracy just be a living life cinematic art of immanence?

In fact what I meant was, I am laughing, that we will live well in Sony after these crises. It is then an artistic life.